



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,851	06/07/2001	Motomu Koike	U 013213-2	7723
7590	02/07/2003			
Ladas & Parry 26 West 61 Street New York, NY 10023			EXAMINER FORTUNA, JOSE A	
			ART UNIT 1731	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 02/07/2003	

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/876,851	KOIKE, MOTOMU
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	José A Fortuna	1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
 \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 1731

## **SUPPLEMENTAL DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicants state that a new office action is required, because they could not infer over which Suskind reference the 103 rejection was based on. The examiner considers that it is evident that the US Patent No. 5,736,204 was used, since it was the only one used in the rejection and like the West reference, no need for stating the number was necessary. Note also that the reference was not discussed in detail in the 103 rejection, because it was already explained in the 102. However, a supplemental action is issued without considering the amendment to the claims, i.e., the rejection is based on the original claims.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 7-8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claims 7-8 refer to a method according to claim 5, however claim 5 is a product claim. The claims are improper because the properties of the product do not further limit the method of making it, (the opposite is permitted, product by process claims, in US Practice).

Art Unit: 1731

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by West et al., US Patent No. 5,906,894.

West et al. teach a multi-ply paper/paperboard having at least two plies, including a ply of crosslinked fibers. West et al. teach that the plies are formed in different molds, headboxes and teach that the plies are joined using pressure and binders, see column 5, line 61 through column 6, line 34.

5. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Suskind, US Patent No. 5,736,204.

Suskind teaches a fully degradable, fully compostable paperboard in which a biodegradable plastic film is coated to at least of the surfaces of a pulp web. The fibers containing web as taught by Suskind are not crosslinked, see column 3, line 37 through column 6, line 57.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1731

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Column.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over West et al., US Patent No. 5,906,894 in view of Suskind, US Patent No. 5,736,204.

Art Unit: 1731

West et al. invention has been explained above. West et al. fail to teach the coating of a  
ply with a plastic film. However Suskind teaches that coating a paperboard with a plastic film  
increases the re-pulpability, compostability and biodegradability of the board as compared to  
common coating, e.g. polyethylene coated paper. Note that in column 9, lines 8-29, West et al.  
teach that the pad has comparable properties to expanded polystyrene, clam-shell packaging box  
used by McDonald's Corporation. Therefore, the use of a coating film as taught by Suskind in the  
multi-ply sheet taught by West et al. would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, in  
order to obtain the benefits indicated above.

*Conclusion*

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's  
disclosure in the art of "multi-ply paper."

10.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner  
should be directed to José Fortuna, whose telephone number is (703)305-7498. The examiner can  
normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 A.M. to 5:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's  
supervisor, Steven P. Griffin, can be reached on (703)308-1164. The fax number for this group is  
(703)305-7115.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be  
directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

When filing a FAX in group 1730, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official"  
for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other

Application/Control Number: 09/876,851

Page 6

Art Unit: 1731

communication with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

José A. Fortuna  
February 5, 2003

  
JOSE FORTUNA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1731